

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

CHRISTOPHER WILLIAM HARRIS,

Plaintiff(s),

v.

LISA COMBS, et al.,

Defendant(s).

CASE NO. C23-0988-KKE

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTIONS FOR MISCELLANEOUS
RELIEF

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff's motion to add a defendant (Dkt. No 16), Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment (Dkt. No. 20), and Plaintiff's motions requesting that the Court initiate an investigation of his claims (Dkt. Nos. 23 & 24).

Plaintiff's motion to add a defendant (Dkt. No. 16) is DENIED because it is duplicative of a subsequent motion (Dkt. No. 21) requesting the same relief.

Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment (Dkt. No. 20) is DENIED without prejudice as premature at this early point in the proceeding, where there are multiple pending motions to amend the complaint. *See, e.g., White v. Sanchez*, No. CV 21-04066-GW (DFM), 2023 WL 4290386, at *1 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 1, 2023) ("Summary judgment is generally not appropriate until the parties have had an opportunity to pursue discovery.").

Plaintiff's motions for investigation (Dkt. Nos. 23 & 24) are DENIED because the Court is aware of no authority supporting this form of relief. *See, e.g., Hawkins v. Mosquidea*, No. ED

1 CV 21-01741-FWS (DFM), 2022 WL 18396425, at *1 (C.D. Cal. Sep. 12, 2022) (denying
2 plaintiff's motion for investigation because he "has not identified, and the Court is unaware of,
3 any Congressional authority permitting the Court to pay for an investigator for him in this civil
4 action").

5 Dated this 13th day of December, 2023.

6 

7 _____
8 Kimberly K. Evanson
9 United States District Judge
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24